

REPRINTED FROM
THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY
MUSEUM NOTES XI

Printed in Germany

THE JAMES II 1/24TH REAL
FOR THE AMERICAN PLANTATIONS*

(SEE PLATE LVI)

The identification of a new major variety of the James II 1/24th real struck in 1688 for the British Dominions in America has created an opportunity to restudy this unusual series and to revise and amend the author's previous article on the subject.¹ The series is referred to as unusual because: (1) the coins are the first duly authorized mintage specifically for the British colonies in America; (2) the coins are the only issue in pure tin for American use; and (3) the coins constitute the only British mintage using a Spanish denomination.

It is well known that by the latter part of the seventeenth century sterling exchange had already become a foreign exchange in transactions in the British colonies in America. Both in North America and the West Indies silver and gold coins struck in Spanish colonial mints were valued in the local money of account of each British colony. Although each such money of account system was calculated in pounds, shillings, and pence, each fluctuated independently, unrelated to English sterling and unrelated to each other. Efforts by England to place a maximum value in local American money of account on Spanish and other specie were unsuccessful and finally culminated in the 1704 Proclamation of Queen Anne followed by the 1707 Act of Parliament (effective May 1, 1709), both of which regulatory measures were virtually unheeded in the colonies.

The American colonies, from their establishment, continually requested circulating coin with a reasonable intrinsic value. They were particularly short of small change, and, as evidenced by the Mas-

* For cooperation and helpfulness, an expression of appreciation is due to the British Public Records Office, Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum, Ashmolean Museum, Fitzwilliam Museum, American Numismatic Society, C. Wilson Peck, Leonard Forrer, Curtis P. Nettels, A. H. Baldwin and Sons, Ltd., B. A. Seaby Ltd., R. H. M. Dolley, Edward F. Schweich, Walter Breen, and Ivor Noel Hume.

¹ Eric P. Newman, "First Documentary Evidence on the American Colonial Pewter 1/24th Real," *The Numismatist*, Vol. 68, No. 7 (July, 1955), p. 713.

sachusetts Bay silver threepence issues beginning in 1652 and the twopence issue dated 1662, small change had to have some realistic and acceptable value.

Before being able to give consideration to small change for its colonies, England had to solve its domestic small change problems. After royal copper coin had secured an acceptance in England the use of tin instead of copper for English minor coins was proposed in 1679 and materialized when English halfpence and farthings were authorized to be struck in tin on May 28, 1684. The purpose was threefold: (1) To satisfy the tin farmers (holders of the mineral rights) whose political power was used to force the Crown to help the tin industry; (2) To produce revenue for the Crown from franchise payments, coinage profits, and coinage duties; and (3) To prevent the extensive counterfeiting of current copper coin. The price of tin had fallen from 12 pence per pound weight in 1676 to 8 pence by 1684 and coinage as a means of price support by the Crown was a solution. The cost of minting and distributing tin coin was approximately 4 pence per pound weight which, added to the cost of the tin, totaled 12 pence per pound weight. The private patents issued for standard minor coinage of tin under Charles II, James II and William and Mary provided for tin coins with a copper plug, the circulating value of which was 20 pence (finally 21 pence) per pound weight, so that the coin passed for about two and one-half times its intrinsic value as metal. This discrepancy in due course caused the cessation of the use of tin for English minor coinage by 1692 and a reversion to copper.²

The tin coinage under Charles II, 1660-1684(5), consisted only of farthings dated 1684 and 1685 which averaged close to their legal weight of 87.5 grains. The coinage was authorized by warrant on the basis of 40% of the profit payable to the Crown and was terminable at the Crown's discretion. James II, 1684(5)-1688, continued this procedure by granting a patent to Thomas Neale, James Hoare and Charles Duncombe on the same basis and tin halfpence were produced dated from 1685 to 1687 and farthings dated from 1684 to 1687.³

² John Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, England, 1953), p. 178.

³ Thomas Snelling, *A View of the Copper Coin and Coinage of England* (London, 1766), p. 38; C. Wilson Peck, *English Copper, Tin and Bronze Coins in the British Museum 1558-1958* (London, 1960), p. 147.

There are no farthings or halfpence dated 1688 so that tin coinage appears to have been discontinued in 1687. New problems as to tin mining and coinage had arisen. The price of tin in 1686 had fallen so low as to cause "the great decay of our stannaries" and because of urgent pleas of the tin mining interests the Crown by an order of August 16, 1687 "out of compassion of their ill circumstances" agreed that it would undertake to arrange to buy all tin produced in Cornwall and Devon at a price of £ 3/10 per hundred weight (7 pence per lb.) which was above the then current price. Devon tin farmers accepted the suggested price on December 14 and the Cornwall tin farmers agreed on December 19, 1687.⁴ Long and tedious negotiations then ensued as to other details. A draft of the proposed Articles of Agreement was prepared in May, 1688 between the Commissioners of the Treasury and John Earle of Bathe, who was Lord Warden of the Stannaries and a cousin of James II. The proposed contract provides an eleven year commitment to buy all tin mined after June 24, 1688 at the agreed price of 7 pence per pound from approved tin farmers. The contract included the sole privilege of coining "pence, halfe pence and farthings of Intrinsic value of Tynn throughout all his Majesty's Dominions (free of all Customes & other Dutys whatsoever for such pence, 1/2 pence & farthings as shall be bonafide coyned to pass (f) or may be exported only for ye purpose". The Commissioners were to receive an annual rent of £ 16,000.⁵

The franchise to mint a distinct coinage for use in the colonies was therefore quite specific and was about to be granted for the first time.⁶ Marginal notations on the draft raised two critical questions: (1) was there a limit on the amount to be coined annually, and (2) what was meant by intrinsic value?

Petitions of May 31 and June 2, 1688 proposed a limit of £ 10,000 per year for three years, after which either the matter would be

⁴ British Public Records Office, S. O. 8/20; T. 52/13, p. 62.

⁵ *Ibid.*, T. 1/2, No. 49.

⁶ The right granted Lord Maltravers on February 16, 1639 to circulate copper farthing tokens in the British plantations, excluding Maryland, referred to farthing tokens made for England, Ireland or Wales. See *The Calendar of State Papers (Colonial Series 1574-1660)*, pp. 285, 290; C. Wilson Peck, *English Copper, Tin and Bronze Coins in the British Museum, 1558-1958* (London, 1960), p. 47n.

reconsidered for a renewal by the Crown or the tin interests could withdraw from their commitment to sell at the agreed price and be free to sell on the open market.⁷ A personal appointment with James II was arranged for June 19, 1688 so that the King might accept particular tin farmers as the proposed contract provided.⁸ Apparently some contract was signed about that time although the text of the final form cannot be found in the British Public Records Office. The reason that some similar contract must have been completed is that there is a reference to it in a petition by the Earle of Bathe dated June 26, 1688 beginning with the statement, "The Farmers of his Majesties Preemption and Coynage duty of Tyn with the sole Privilege of making Tyn-farthings, Pence and Halfpence of Intrinsick value for all his Majesties Dominions . . ." The June 26, 1688 petition was a request that the Commissioners of the Treasury permit "the Engines, Presses, tools and Utensils belonging to his Majesty in Skinners Hall" which equipment was used "in making or vending the late Tyn farthings" (the royal farthings of James II) to be made available to Richard Holt who had been approved as one of the tin farmers to make tin coins for the dominions.⁹ Since rent on Skinner's Hall had been paid by the Crown up to the lease expiration on August 8, 1688, the tin farmers asked for the free privilege of using that site for coining for the balance of the term. They also agreed to return the equipment to the Crown after using it.¹⁰

The petition asked for the use of the equipment forthwith to make patterns to be submitted to the King for his approval. No patterns or coinage of any minor coinage under James II are known and thus it appears that the only patterns prepared under the contract were the 1/24th real pieces for the plantations. These patterns were submitted

⁷ British Public Records Office, T. 1/2, Nos. 48 and 50.

⁸ Ibid., T. 27/11, p. 393.

⁹ Ibid., T. 1/2, No. 51; Curtis P. Nettels, "British Policy and Colonial Money Supply," *The Economic History Review*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Oct., 1931), p. 10; Curtis P. Nettels, "The Money Supply of the American Colonies before 1720," *University of Wisconsin Studies in Social Sciences and History*, No. 20, (Madison, 1934), p. 177.

¹⁰ The lease on Skinner's Hall was extended by the Crown until December, 1869 when the premises were vacated. John Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, England, 1953), p. 179.

for approval as to design as well as to intrinsic value in the following letter:¹¹

Officers of the Mint

Gentlemen

By order of the Lord's Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury I send you the enclosed letter from Mr. Holt on behalf of the Tynn ffarmers with a Modell of the New ffarthings intended to be Coyned. Their Lordships direct you to Certify them if you have any objection to what is therein desired. I am etc H. Guy 13th August 1688.

London 27th July 1688

My Lord

The ffarthings which Wee intreat your Lordship to present for his Majesty's approbacon is made after the rate of 10 d p l (10 pence per lb.) and 2 d p l (2 pence per lb.) for the Coynage of them. The Inscription on the Revers, Vis: vall 24. part Riall Hispan. is because the said Coyne are intended to pass in his Majesty's Plantacons & such parts of his Dominions where they only take Spanish money & value all coyne by that Measure, Soe that without that Inscription those people will not take them.

And a Ryall being 6d Sterling in value it's alsoe convenient for his Majesty's Europian Dominions. And we entreat your Lordship to obtaine his Majesty's approbacon soe as Wee may proceed on the Coynage of them pursuant to the Groat charge we have been at to procure the Modell. Your Lordship's most humble servant, Richard Holt, for self and company.

To introduce a tin coin into circulation in the American Dominions required substantial intrinsic value and for that reason the July 27, 1688 letter indicates that the tin coins for the dominions would have a circulating value of 10 pence per pound weight which was twice the amount of tin as was contained in the English royal tin coinage having an equal circulating value. The "groat charge" of 4 pence per pound weight for coining was therefore twice the cost of making the same circulating value in tin coin of the earlier issues under James II. The fear of the rejection of tin coinage in the dominions was a matter of concern to the coiners as they stated in the July 27, 1688 letter that the coins would be rejected if a Spanish denomination was not designated on the coin. The value of 1/24th of a real in Spanish exchange

¹¹ British Public Records Office, Treasury Out Letter Book, Tome 27/11, P. 424.

was about equal to one farthing in sterling exchange. Thus forty pieces of the $\frac{1}{24}$ th real would circulate for 10 pence sterling and would have only 7 pence in intrinsic value of tin because they would weigh one pound. With normal coinage and distribution costs the planned intrinsic value was reasonable. Unfortunately, none of the $\frac{1}{24}$ th real pieces weighed 40 to the pound weight or 175 grains each as stated. They only weighed 135 grains each on the average making them have an actual tin value of less than $5\frac{1}{2}$ pence per pound weight and were intended to circulate for $1\frac{2}{3}$ reales (10 pence sterling) per pound weight.

The word "plantacons" could only mean American dominions because no other plantations used Spanish money. Plantations in America meant Newfoundland, the colonies on the North American continent, and the West Indies. If the "plantacons" were only the colonies of the West Indies then it would have been pointed out that coins bearing a Spanish denomination could be conveniently used on the North American continent in the same manner as their possible use in the English dominions in Europe was mentioned.

The diameter as well as the weight of these plantation $\frac{1}{24}$ th real (one farthing) pieces were equivalent to the Royal tin halfpence which were in circulation in England. The plantation issue would therefore have been very disruptive of tin circulation in England by virtue of having twice the tin weight of the farthing in England and being of the same diameter as the halfpence. Even if sent to America some were bound to come back to England. It is therefore somewhat doubtful whether the circulation of the Plantation farthings was formally approved as no record to that effect has been found. It is also possible that even if approval had been obtained the few remaining months of the reign of James II had elapsed before distribution in America had been planned or carried out. Even though many pieces were struck in anticipation of formal approval and actual distribution it is unsound to conclude that any reached America until evidence of their circulation in the American plantations is found.

The tin interests did not seem satisfied with their contract and on July 30, 1688 James II authorized the Earle of Bathe to work out further agreements with the tin farmers to buy all of the tin which they could produce at 7 pence per pound weight, to pay 6 days after

delivery, to waive the Crown's coinage duty of 4 shillings per hundred weight, to permit four free coinages yearly at coinage towns and to lend money on a short term basis for the mining operations.¹² These coinages never took place so we can reasonably assume that the political troubles of James II, culminating in his flight from England on December 23, 1688, ended all further negotiations relating to tin coinage during his reign. Thereafter the control of coinage and the Mint passed from the Crown to the ministers and Parliament.¹³ Those 1/24th real pieces which had been minted were left without anyone to support their circulation after the change in government. Noel Ivor Hume, prior to becoming the present archaeologist at Colonial Williamsburg, found three Plantation 1/24th real pieces in London in the mud on the bank of the Thames river, but no other archaeological evidence of finding coins of this issue has been reported.

THE AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD TIN COINS

In 1690 a shipment of royal tin farthings and halfpence and some copper halfpence was sent to the Leeward Islands for payment of salaries of an English regiment. The governor, on July 13, 1691 pointed out that the coins could not be used for trade at English values and would, contrary to English policy, have to be deflated by one-third in order to circulate.¹⁴ This indicates that the 1/24th real would have circulated well in those islands.

Thomas Neale who was master of the Mint and a promoter of speculative enterprises suggested on January 19, 1691 that New England might "be supplied with Pence, Halfe Pence, & farthing of Tinn, from England, to their Majesties Advantage,"¹⁵ but nothing came of it.

In 1698 the reaction of the American colonists to a threat of lead and pewter coinage being circulated in quantity was demonstrated by a protest of fifty-three merchants in Philadelphia in the following manner:¹⁶

¹² British Public Records Office, S. O. 8/20.

¹³ John Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, England, 1953), p. 180.

¹⁴ Codrington to Lords of Trade, C. O. 152/38, No. 33.

¹⁵ Robert Chalmers, *A History of the Currency in the British Colonies* (London, 1893), p. 10.

¹⁶ Harrold Gillingham, *Counterfeiting in Colonial Pennsylvania*, NNM 86, p. 6.

To the Generall Assembly now Sitting the petition of Sundry the Inhabitants of this province most humbly Sheweth.

WHEREAS your petition's being Inhabitants of this province and being given to understand that there is great Quantities of Leaden and pewter farthings & half pence whereby your petition's are likely to be much Damaged by Reason such great Quantity's are Liable to be Crowded upon us.

Now these are to Protest & humbly Interest that you would be pleased to make an act of Assembly That all such farthings & half pence that are made of Lead & pewter may be wholly suppressed & Cryed Down and only those of Copper which are the Kings Coyn may pass the farthings for two a penny & the half pence for a penny ... Philadelphia the twenty first of the third month 1698.

In Massachusetts Bay Colony on February 21, 1700 an act was passed prohibiting the coining or passing of base or counterfeit money due to the fact that "some persons for private gain have of late presumed to stamp and emit peices of brass and tin at the rate of one penny each, not regarding what loss they thereby bring on others, ..." The tin pieces referred to have not been identified, although Crosby suggests the remote possibility that the reference might have been to the "New Yorke" token. The Act, however, does not reflect a specific attitude toward the circulation of tin coinage, but indicates a general opposition to the issuance of private token money coined in any metal.

CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

In order to verify why the plantation 1/24th real is often found so deteriorated a modern chemical analysis has been made. Its composition showed 97.46% of tin and .015% of antimony with the balance being non-metallic.¹⁷ The non-metallic elements are natural impurities such as clay and ash from mining and smelting. Since no other metal was mixed with the tin and the amount of antimony is insignificant the pieces are not properly referred to as pewter which the writer and others have done in the past. The deterioration which sometimes takes place on the surface of the coins is therefore a natural change in the allotropic form of tin, caused by a breakdown in its crystalline struc-

¹⁷ Chemical data were supplied through the courtesy of the Lewin-Mathes Division of the Cerro Corporation, St. Louis, Missouri.

ture. This change is stimulated by exposure to winter temperatures and the surfaces of many specimens of the 1/24th real are defaced in isolated areas by this deterioration. The effect of such deterioration is illustrated in obverses 6 and 7 (PLATE LVI).

The specific gravity of the coins ranges from 6.4 to 7.3. In some cases the changes in the crystalline structure of the tin has increased the volume of the coin and thus lowered its specific gravity.

A NEW MAJOR DIE VARIETY

A newly identified major variety (Reverse G) of the 1/24th real has the unusual distinction of having the Irish harp and the Scottish lion transposed. The four coats of arms on the reverse of all other varieties maintain the following order in a clockwise direction: England, Scotland, France and Ireland. This normal order is in accordance with the title of James II in the obverse legend. To find Ireland in second position on the new variety, displacing Scotland, might humorously be construed as an Irish revolt from being placed in last position, but it is merely a diemaker's error. The punch for each coat of arms was separately used in cutting the die and thus the transposition of the coats of arms is a similar mistake to the "sidewise 4" on reverse C. The HB for HIB on Obverse 1 was not an unintentional error as the diemaker, when punching in the legend, did not have enough space remaining.¹⁸

The new reverse G was first located in the British Museum cabinet and has since been located only in a very few collections.

A comprehensive revision of data on all known die varieties has been prepared now that collectors have had the opportunity of checking their pieces against the 1955 listing. Seven obverses and seven reverses are now noted in nine combinations. The obverses are generally similar, the only major variation being the spelling of the legend with HB instead of HIB. The reverses show 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 strings in the harp; and either large or small fleurs-de-lis are found in the French coat of arms. The die cutting errors in Reverse C and G have been noted. The edge of all pieces contains a band of about 90

¹⁸ See comments by Walter Breen in "Blundered Dies of Colonial and U. S. Mints," *Empire Topics* (July, 1958), p. 16.

raised dots milled onto the planchet with a Castaing machine before striking. Since illustrations of the die varieties have not heretofore been published a plate has been included showing such varieties and their combinations. The following descriptive table of die varieties showing their combinations has been revised to accompany the plate:

TABLE OF DIE VARIETIES

<i>Obverse descriptions</i>		
<i>Obv. No.</i>		<i>With Rev.</i>
1	Head directly under G. HB instead of HIB. Hoof ends under center of right base of X.	A
2	Head directly under G. Top leaf touches G. No period after X. Hoof ends under right end of base of E.	B G
3	Head centered under space between G and B favoring G. O in JACOBUS high. Hoof ends under right side of right base of X.	C
4	Head centered under space between G and B favoring B. F in FRAN higher than preceding I. Hoof ends under space slightly right of base of X.	D E
5	Head centered under space between G and B favoring B. D G widely separated. Hoof ends under right side of right base of X. Die break connecting AN and HI.	D
6	Head centered under space between G and B favoring G. Right side of base of second I of II higher than base of adjacent D. Hoof ends under left base of X.	F
7	Head under space between G and B favoring G. Leaf touches B. First I in II much too high. Hoof ends under center of X.	F

<i>Reverse Descriptions</i>		
<i>Rev. Letter</i>		<i>With Obv.</i>
A	6 strings in harp. Large fleurs-de-lis and lions. Head of lowest lion left of heads of other two.	1
B	7 strings in harp. Large fleurs-de-lis and lions. Line of lions' heads rises to left. Right fleur higher than left fleur.	2

<i>Rev. Letter</i>		<i>With Obv.</i>
C	8 strings in harp with diagonal string between third and fifth. Sidewise 4 in 24. Large fleurs-de-lis and lions. Right fleur is higher than left fleur.	3
D	11 strings in harp. Small fleurs-de-lis and lions. Right fleur slightly lower than left fleur. Lions' heads in vertical line.	4 5
E	7 strings in harp with top three close. Small fleurs-de-lis. Highest lion distant from and left of other two.	4
F	6 strings in harp. Large fleurs-de-lis and lions. Lowest lion's head right of heads of other two.	6 7
G	5 strings in harp. Large fleurs-de-lis and lions. Irish and Scottish coats of arms transposed so that Irish follows English coat of arms in clockwise direction.	2

RESTRIKES

The dies for the 1/24th real were apparently cut by John Roettier, who with other members of his family, although originally from Flanders, devoted most of their lives to engraving for the Royal English Mint.¹⁹ Customarily, coinage dies were the property and responsibility of the die sinker. In the course of political difficulties all of the Roettier dies and punches were seized by the Crown on March 27, 1697, but soon thereafter returned.²⁰ Over a century later the Roettier descendants decided to sell the dies and Matthew Young, an English coin dealer, acquired them in 1828. Young thereupon sold many of the coin dies to the British Museum in that year²¹ and the dies for medals in the following year. He retained the 1/24th real dies and the edging dies and undertook to make restrikes from these dies shortly thereafter.²²

¹⁹ Philip Nelson, "The Early Coinage of America (1558-1774)," *The Connoisseur*, Vol. 31 (Sept., 1911), p. 18.

²⁰ John Craig, *The Mint* (Cambridge, England, 1953), pp. 195, 196.

²¹ H. Farquhar, "Concerning Some Roettier Dies," *Numismatic Chronicle* (1917), p. 126; Corroborative correspondence from the British Museum.

²² Henry Christmas, "The Anglo-American Coinage," *AJN*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Oct., 1872), p. 39, and in *Numismatic Chronicle* (London, 1862), Vol. 2, New Series, p. 20; Phillip Nelson, "The Early Coinage of America (1558-1774)," *The Connoisseur*, Vol. 31 (Sept., 1911), p. 18.

Although Philip Nelson stated that the restrikes could be easily distinguished from the originals by the "suspicious quality of the metal" the passage of time has made it much more difficult. Apparently Young only used two obverse dies (4 and 5) and two reverse dies (D and E). Quantities of combination 5-D were restruck in tin, along with a few 4-D and 4-E. All of these restrikes have a properly dotted edge. In copper one restrike is known struck in combination 4-E and with a plain edge.

The surface of the field of the tin restrikes is very smooth whereas the originals have a granulated surface and often show signs of tin pest. The restrikes retain a uniform bright appearance (possibly because of the tin being purer) whereas the originals have turned grey in some parts or throughout. American sales catalogues were distinguishing restrikes from originals by 1864.²³ At least three-fourths of all 1/24th real pieces in collections are restrikes of combination 5-E.

PRIOR NUMISMATIC COMMENT

Because of the complexity in the determination of the background of the 1/24th real a brief review of previous articles seems desirable.²⁴

²³ W. Elliot Woodward, *Sale of the McCoy Collection*, May 17, 1864, Lots 199 and 1645.

²⁴ Stephen Martin Leake, *An Historical Account of English Money* (London, 1726), p. 127; *English and Scottish Coins with other Numismatic Material Collected by Thomas Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery* (1746), Part 4, pl. 21; Thomas Snelling, *A View of the Coins Struck in the West India Colonies* (London, 1769), p. 38; Noel Humphreys, *The Gold, Silver and Copper Coins of England* (London, 1849), p. 96, and *The Coinage of the British Empire* (London, 1854), p. 125; Montroville W. Dickeson, *The American Numismatist Manual* (Philadelphia, 1859), p. 69, 70; William C. Prime, *Coins, Medals, and Seals* (New York, 1861), p. 70; Sylvester S. Crosby, *Early Coins of America* (Boston, 1875), p. 348; Edouard Frossard, *Monograph of the United States Cents and Half Cents* (Irrington, 1879), p. 48; James Atkins, *The Coins and Tokens of the British Possessions and Colonies of the British Empire* (London, 1889), p. 257; Robert Chalmers, *A History of Currency in the British Colonies* (London, 1893), p. 100; Gertrude B. Rawlings, *Coins and How to Know Them* (New York, 1908), p. 319; Fred W. Burgess, *Chats on Old Coins* (London, 1913), p. 314; Wayte Raymond, *Standard Catalogue of United States Coins and Tokens* (New York, 1934-57); Richard S. Yeoman, *A Guide Book of United States Coins* (Racine, 1947 to date); Phares O. Sigler, "James II Plantation Half Penny," *The Numismatist*, Vol. 57, No. 5 (May, 1944), p. 393, and in *Coin Collector's Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (July, 1944), p. 86; Eric P. Newman, "First Documentary Evidence on the American Colonial Pewter 1/24th Real," *The Numismatist*, Vol. 68, No. 7 (July, 1955), p. 713.

The Plantation 1/24th real, designated as a farthing by its coiners, was first described numismatically in 1726 as "the Plantation Half-Penny" by Stephen Martin Leake. This error in the denominational value is logical because the coin was the size of a royal English tin halfpence. The error was continued by Burgess in 1913 and Sigler in 1944. The coin was first illustrated as "K. James's Small Money for the Plantations" in 1746 in the Pembroke Plates and described as "pewter with a copper cross inserted." The small copper cross embellishment on each side of the coin was one of the many frauds perpetrated upon the Earl of Pembroke in his eagerness to acquire unusual items for his collection.²⁵ No copper plug of any kind is found on any 1/24th real piece, such plugs being confined to the royal English tin coinage. The reference to pewter composition was a mistake which Burgess, Sigler, and this author followed.

Snelling in 1769 properly described the pieces as "coins of the plantations" and Humphreys in 1854, Dickeson in 1859, and Atkins in 1889, justifiably enlarged this to "American plantations." Prime in 1861 and Crosby in 1875 eliminated the coin as an early American piece, but that opinion was based upon lack of evidence rather than negative evidence. Burgess in 1913 said that the coin was minted specially for Virginia and Henry Chapman went along with that thought.²⁶ The fact that a Spanish denomination was used did not deter numismatists from assigning the piece to Florida, even though Florida was not even English at the time. While Crosby, Chalmers, and others refute the Florida allocation Raymond and Yeomans in all of their editions list it under Florida, but Raymond after 1945 points out that a better view is to assign it to American Plantations in general. J. J. Mickley was alleged to have "thought it was coined for William Penn."²⁷ Walter Breen, in graciously mentioning the author's 1955 article on the coins, indicated that they were known as "Black Dogs."²⁸

²⁵ In 1848 when the Pembroke Collection was auctioned Lot 231 contained the Plantation 1/24th real and there was no trace of any copper cross on the coin. See also Eric P. Newman, *The Secret of the Good Samaritan Shilling*, NNM 142, p. 15.

²⁶ *The Numismatist*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (March, 1916), p. 105.

²⁷ Stan V. Henkels, Sale of the Collection of Edward Maris on June 21, 1886, Lot 306.

²⁸ Walter Breen, "The Collector's Necessary Equipment," *Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Mar., 1963), p. 656.

While the royal English tin coinage or the $1/24$ th real or a host of other coins might have been known as such in America there is as yet no evidence to support the $1/24$ th real being so referred to.

The various expressions of opinion as to the $1/24$ th real, right or wrong, demonstrated the need for securing valid numismatic proof. With the documentary and other evidence presented in the 1955 article and herein it seems clear that the James II $1/24$ real was struck in 1688 for general use in the British Plantations in America as a whole and because Spanish money circulated there, its denomination was in Spanish money which had a sterling equivalent of one farthing.

ERIC P. NEWMAN



A



1



G



B



2



6



C



3



F



D



4



7



E



5



5

Restrike

JAMES II — 1/24TH REAL

